



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,098	02/04/2002	Moran Amidan	U 013862-5	4304
140	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY 26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023			HOANG, THAI D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2616

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/067,098	AMIDAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thai D. Hoang	2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thai D. Hoang - Patent Examiner.

(3) Daniel Kligler - Applicants Representative.

(2) Doris To - Supervisor.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 May 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: .

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: May et al, USPAT 5,835,536.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' proposal amendment overcomes the prior art and Examiner needs to update search. Applicants Representative agrees to delete the clause "adapt to" in claims 28 and 49.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Application of : **AMIDAN et al.**

Serial No.: 10/067,098 : Group Art Unit: 2668

Filed : February 4, 2002 : Examiner: Thai D. Hoang

For : DATA PARTITIONING FOR MULTI-LINK TRANSMISSION

May 16, 2006

DRAFT AMENDMENT - NOT FOR ENTRY

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Sir:

In response to an Official Action dated March 9, 2006, Applicant proposes the following amendment for discussion in an interview.

A proposed amendment to the claims begin on page 2.
Remarks accompanying the amendment begin on page 4.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

1. (Currently amended) A method for transmitting a stream of data over a channel made up of a plurality of subchannels having respective subchannel rates, the method comprising:

partitioning the data among the subchannels, such that responsive to the respective subchannel rates, successive words of the data, including at least first, second and third words in succession, are mapped to the subchannels in alternation responsive to the respective subchannel rates, whereby the first word is mapped to a first subchannel, the second word is mapped to a second subchannel, and the third word is mapped to one of the first subchannel and a third subchannel;

transmitting the words of the data over the subchannels to which they are mapped; and

receiving and processing the words from the subchannels to recover the stream of data.

...

23. (Currently amended) A method for transmitting a stream of data over a channel made up of a plurality of subchannels, the method comprising:

framing the data in a sequence of data blocks in accordance with a data framing protocol;

partitioning the data in each of the blocks among the subchannels, such that successive words of the data, including at least first, second and third words in succession, are mapped to the subchannels in alternation, whereby the first word is mapped to a first subchannel, the second word is mapped to a second subchannel, and the third word is mapped to one of the first subchannel and a third subchannel, in a manner substantially independent of the framing of the data blocks;

transmitting the words of the data over the subchannels to which they are mapped; and

receiving and processing the words from the subchannels so as to reassemble the data blocks.

REMARKS

This application includes claims 1-53. Claims 1, 2, 23, 28, 29 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner considered the use of the word "alternation" in these claims to be unclear. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 22-25, 28-32, 35-38 and 48-51 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over May et al. (U.S. Patent 5,835,536).

Applicant proposes to amend claims 1 and 23 (as well as the corresponding apparatus claims) in order to clarify the meaning of the term "alternation." This sort of alternation is implemented (in a simple embodiment) in Table I on page 16 of the present patent application and is shown explicitly in the example on page 17. Extension of the alternation to three channels is shown in Fig. 3 and described on page 18.

This clarification of the meaning of alternation also makes clear the distinction of the claimed invention over the cited art. May relates to discrete multi-tone symbol generation and makes no suggestion of the type of word-by-word alternation that is recited in the amended claims.